UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/533,101	03/20/2006	Nigel Hugh Sanders	1307-5 PCT/US	2312	
	7590 05/18/2019 & <b>BARON</b> , LLP	EXAMINER			
6900 JERICHO SYOSSET, NY	TURNPIKE	KRAUSE, ANDREW E			
51055E1, N1	11/91		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1781		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/18/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/533,101	SANDERS ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
	Aironn		

	ANDREW KRAUSE	1781						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>23 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, www. with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	ionac with 27 CED 41 27 must be f	ilad within two months	of the data of					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);								
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	**	li	an innung fan					
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li></ul>	er form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying ti	ne issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	one openang namber of imany reje	otou olaliilo.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mnliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)					
<ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ul>		inpliant / incliament (i	102 02+).					
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [	will not be entered, or b) will	be entered and an ex	xplanation of					
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov								
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8 and 11-13</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a					
10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ( 13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
/Lien Tran/	/ANDREW KRAUSE/							
Primary Examiner	Examiner, Art Unit 1781							
Art unit 1781								

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1. Applicant argues that, "Aldrich is directed to a method for preparing co-deposited, two-component hard candy having a hard candy shell portion and core portion that may be soft. Aldrich states that the core may be milk-based and mentions chocolate. However, nowhere in Aldrich are examples employing chocolate disclosed or suggested, in contrast, one example describes a shell composition that is maintained at about 290 F (143 C) and a core composition that is held at about 100 F (37"~C). If one of skill in the art were to employ chocolate in place of the soft candy core, the process would not be effective. The chocolate would be heated toward 290 F, become too viscous and thus block the equipment."

- 2. It is first noted that the use of patents as references is not limited to what the patentees describe as their own inventions or to the problems with which they are concerned. They are part of the literature of the art, relevant for all they contain." In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)). A reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including nonpreferred embodiments. Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989). Clearly Aldrich suggests the use of chocolate as the core component.
- 3. With respect to applicants argument that the chocolate would become to viscous and thus block the equipment, no evidence is provide to support this assertion. As Aldrich discloses the use of chocolate as a potential core component, and carries out the claimed method steps of:
- a. Preparing a liquid candy composition which solidifies upon cooling, said liquid composition being a first temperature (column 4, lines 51-65);
- b. Preparing a second liquid composition which solidifies upon cooling (column 3, lines 25-40), said second liquid composition being at a second temperature which is lower than the first temperature(column 4, lines 62-66);and
- c. Co-depositing the liquid candy composition and the second liquid composition in molds (column 3, line 63 to column 4, line 5).
- 4. Nothing in the Aldrich reference, or evidence provided by applicant suggests that the process disclosed by Aldrich would be inoperable when carried out with chocolate. Before turning to the disclosure of Bollinger, it is additionally noted that "Where...the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, the PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product. Whether the rejection is based on "inherency" under 35 USC 102, on "prima facie obviousness" under 35 USC 103, jointly or alternatively, the burden of proof is the same, and its fairness is evidenced by the PTO's inability to manufacture products or to obtain and compare prior art products. See In re Brown, 59 CCPA 1036, 459 F.2d 531, 173 USPQ 685 (1972)." In re Best, Bolton and Shaw 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977). Thus, it appears that the level of shear generated on the chocolate in the Aldrich depositor nozzle would be within the claimed range.
- 5. In response to applicant's argument that Bollinger does not apply high sheer is not being applied to increase the critical temperature of the chocolate, I, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, and then it meets the claim. With respect to the temperatures used, independent claim 1 does not specify that the mixture is at the critical temperature. Further, the primary reference, Aldrich discloses the use of a core temperature of 38 C (about 40 C). The Bollinger reference is cited to disclose the amount of shear produced by the nozzle, which results in chocolate with desirable characteristics.